

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/833,667	04/13/2001	Manjari Kuntimaddi	174-885	1721	
23517 DINGHAM M	7590 12/12/2007	EXAMINER			
2020 K Street, N.W.			HUNTER, ALVIN A		
	Manjari Kuntimaddi 174-885 1721  7590 12/12/2007 HAM MCCUTCHEN LLP  K Street, N.W. ctual Property Department HINGTON, DC 20006  Manjari Kuntimaddi 174-885 1721  EXAMINER  HUNTER, ALVIN A  ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER  3711  MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE	PAPER NUMBER			
	,		3711	· · · · · · ·	
	÷		174-885 1721  EXAMINER  HUNTER, ALVIN A  ART UNIT PAPER NUME  3711		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/12/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		H		
<del></del>		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
·		09/833,667	KUNTIMADDI ET AL.	
Office Action Sur	tion Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Alvin A. Hunter	3711	
The MAILING DATE of th Period for Reply	is communication a	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address -	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FR - Extensions of time may be available unde after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing da	OM THE MAILING r the provisions of 37 CFR ate of this communication. The maximum statutory perion of the reply will, by state three months after the market the market state of the market the market state the market the market the market state the market the market	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- tod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  eply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communica  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
<ul><li>1)⊠ Responsive to communic</li><li>2a)  This action is FINAL.</li></ul>				
<u> </u>	•—	his action is non-final.	ers, prosecution as to the merits	e ie
		er <i>Ex par</i> te <i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	• •	, 13
Disposition of Claims	•	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
4)  Claim(s) 1-4,8-23,39 and 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5)  Claim(s) 4,39 and 45-51 6)  Claim(s) 1-3,8-18 and 21 7)  Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are 8)  Claim(s) are subject Application Papers  9)  The specification is object 10)  The drawing(s) filed on	is/are withd s/are allowed. -23 is/are rejected. objected to. ct to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	ov the Evaminer	
		he drawing(s) be held in abeyan	-	
		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	1(d).
11) The oath or declaration is	objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
<ol> <li>Copies of the certif application from the</li> </ol>	None of: the priority docume the priority docume ted copies of the priority the International Bure	ents have been received. ents have been received in A	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)				
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw.</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	ng Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date formal Patent Application 	

09/833,667 Art Unit: 3711

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 39, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimosaka (USPN 5816937) in view of Blahak et al. (USPN 4631319).

Regarding claim 39, Shimosaka discloses a golf ball having a core and a cover and at least a layer between the cover and core wherein a layer covering the core is formed of polyurethane. Shimosaka does not disclose the polyurethane being an IPN. Blahak et al. discloses composition comprising a homopolymer or copolymer including an uretdione group (dimer) wherein the composition can be used to make an interpenetrating polymer network such as those listed in column 10, lines 60 through 68. Shimosaka notes that the material for the layer is not critical although polyurethanes, ionomer, etc are well known ones. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a layer covering the cover made of an IPN having an uretdione group, as taught by Blahak et al., in order to improve strength.

Regarding claims 45 and 46, Shimosaka et al. does not note if the material for the layers are thermoset or thermoplastic. Blahak et al. discloses that the thermoset composition can be combined with thermoplastic compositions in order to form IPNs.

Application/Control Number:

09/833,667 Art Unit: 3711

One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the layers thermoplastic and/or thermoset so long as the strength is improved.

Claims 1-3, 8-18, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy, III et al. (USPN 6290614) in view of Frisch et al. (USPN 4742128).

Regarding claims 1, 18, and 22, Kennedy, III et al. discloses a golf ball having a solid core and a cover and at least a layer between the cover and core wherein a layer covering the core is formed of RIM polyurethane. Kennedy, III et al. does not disclose the polyurethane being an IPN. Frisch et al. discloses an interpenetrating polymer network formed of RIM polyurethane. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a layer covering the cover made of a polyurethane IPN, as taught by Frisch et al., in order to improve strength. Further, it is submitted that that shear category is at least one less than that of which is free of an IPN being that the composition has improved strength.

Regarding claim 2, Kennedy, III et al. notes that the core, intermediate layer, or cover can be made of a RIM polyurethane. In combination with Frisch et al., one having ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to have any of these layers to be made of a IPN in order to improve strength.

Regarding claim 3, Kennedy, III et al. discloses the cover having a hardness greater than 15 Shore A and the golf ball having a COR greater than 0.7 See (examples).

09/833,667 Art Unit: 3711

Regarding claim 8, see the above regarding claim 1. Further, Frisch et al. notes that the RIM polyurethane composition may be a semi-IPN.

Regarding claim 9, Kennedy, III et al. notes that the core, intermediate layer, or cover can be made of a RIM polyurethane. In combination with Frisch et al., one having ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to have any of these layers to be made of a semi-IPN in order to improve strength.

Regarding claims 10-17, see the above regarding claim 1. Further, the additional limitations regarding the glass transition temperature, phase size, and melting exotherm are presumed to naturally flow from the prior art being that the office does not have the ability to compare these limitations through testing.

Regarding claim 21, Kennedy, III et al. discloses the cover having an inner and outer cover (See Figure 3).

Regarding claim 22 and 23, see the above regarding claim 1.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 39, and 45-51 are allowed.

Claims 19 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/06/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Fritsch require the mold to be heated higher than

09/833,667

Art Unit: 3711

Kennedy, III et al. It is notes the Kennedy, III et al. uses 100 to 180F as an example and thus is not limiting. For this reason the above rejection has been furnished.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is 571-272-4411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene Kim, can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-19197 (toll-free).

Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.